

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P. Do. 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

			`	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,030	12/19/2001	Gwo-Ji Horng	JCLA8482	9497
75	90 04/02/2004		EXAM	INER
J.C. Patents, Inc.			TRINH, MINH N	
4 Venture, Suite 250 Irvine, CA 92618			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3729	6
			DATE MAILED: 04/02/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		11
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/034,030	HORNG ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Minh Trinh	3729
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the learned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ron. n. a reply within the statutory minimum of third eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	16 December 2003.	
	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for all	owance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice und	der <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)	ndrawn from consideration. is/are rejected. /are objected to.	·
Application Papers		•
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.	
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐	accepted or b) ☐ objected to	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyan	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	prrection is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9483) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SI Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/034,030 Page 2

Art Unit: 3729

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed in paper No. 6 (dated 12/16/2003) has been fully considered and made of record.

- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 26 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Araki et al (US 5,855,711). This rejection is set forth in prior Office Action, Paper No. 4, dated 9/24/2003, paragraph 3.
- 4. Claims 27-29, 33, 34, 37-39, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araki et al (US 5,855,711). This rejection is set forth in prior Office Action, Paper No. 4, dated 9/24/2003, paragraph 5.
- 5. Claims 1-5 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araki et al (US 5,855,711) in view of Watanabe et al (US 6,326,651). This rejection is set forth in prior Office Action, Paper No. 4, dated 9/24/2003, paragraph 6.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicants' arguments filed in paper No. 5, dated 12/16/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Application/Control Number: 10/034,030

Art Unit: 3729

Page 3

- a). Applicants' arguments under the heading "Remarks" that the Araki et al fails to disclose the step of "before co-firing thermal conductive openings are formed through green tapes and a metal paste is filled into the thermal conductive openings" (see under the "Remarks", page 14, 2nd paragraph, lines 4-6). The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons, Applicants are referred to Figs. 4-5 of Araki et al, depicts a plurality of green tapes 20 having conductive openings 21 and the conductive metal filled 51 associated thereof). Therefore, the limitation as described above is met by Araki et al.
- b) Regarding to reference 51 of Araki et al, it is clearly that 51 is a conductor being filled with the via hole 21 (as clearly shown in Fig. 4 and the discussion at col. 6, lines 41-43).
- c) Further, In response to applicants' arguments (see under "Remarks" page 14, 2nd paragraph, lines 10-11) that the references fail to show certain features of applicants' invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "the heat generated by a chip can be transmitted to the ambient through the conductor) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
- d) Applicants' arguments, under the "Remarks", page 15, 1st paragraph have been carefully reviewed and are not persuasive for the same reasons as set forth in a-c above.
- * In light of the above, Applicant's arguments with respect to Araki et al and/or Araki in view of Watanabe, are moot. It is noted that Applicants' arguments do not

Application/Control Number: 10/034,030 Page 4

Art Unit: 3729

clearly point out the patentable novelty, which they think the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the rejection made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 6-10, 13-14, 30-32 and 35-36 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter as set forth in prior Office Action dated 9/24/2003.

Interviews After Final

8. Applicants note that an interview after a final rejection will not be granted unless the intended purpose and content of the interview in presented briefly, in writing (the agenda of the interview must be in writing). Such an interview may be granted if the examiner is convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration. Interviews merely to restate arguments of record or to discuss new limitations which would require more than nominal reconsideration or new search will be denied. See MPEP 714.13 and 713.09.

Conclusion

9. Please provide numeral references to the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure (i.e., page and line numbers and reference number associated with

Art Unit: 3729

from the drawings) for better clarity. Applicants require pointing out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure and the claims. See 37CFR 1.111 and section 2163.06 of the MPEP.

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-2887. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (703) 308-1789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

Patent Examiner Group 3729